



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/585,747	06/02/2000	Smaragda Hadjinikitas	Syner-161XX	7128
207	7590	02/03/2004	EXAMINER	
WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON, MA 02109			DINH, MINH	

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/585,747	HADJINIKITAS ET AL.
	Examiner Minh Dinh	Art Unit 2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 have been examined.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: change the word "buss" (page 8, line 5) to "bus". Appropriate correction is required.
3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. (6,584,505) in view of Moriconi et al. (6,158,010).

a. Regarding claims 1 and 4, Howard et al. disclose a method of authenticating a user of a client computer at a server computer, comprising the steps of:
receiving a service request from the user at a first data processing agent (col. 6, lines 40-42);

submitting an authentication request from the first data processing agent to a second data processing agent to authenticate the user (col. 6, lines 51-52; col. 8, lines 29-32);

receiving a response to the authentication request at the first data processing agent from the second data processing agent (col. 7, lines 44-45); and

if the received response indicates that the user is successfully authenticated, providing the requested service to the user (col. 7, lines 54-56).

Howard does not disclose that the data processing agents are on the same server. Moriconi et al. disclose that two data processing agents are implemented on the same server (col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the method of Howard such that the first and second data processing agents are implemented on the same server to provide maximum performance and minimize network traffic overhead.

b. Regarding claim 2, Howard does not disclose that the received response includes a level of access privileges for the user, and the providing step includes the step of determining the service provided to the user based upon the user's access privilege level. Moriconi et al. disclose a level of access privileges for a user (col. 7, lines 41-41) and the step of determining the service provided to the user based upon the user's access privilege level (col. 8, lines 25-28, col. 13, lines 18-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the method of Howard such that the received response includes a level of access privileges for the user, and the providing step includes the step of determining

the service provided to the user based upon the user's access privilege level. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide service to authorized users only.

c. Regarding claim 3, Howard further discloses that the first data processing agent is included in a first server and the second data processing agent is included in a second server (see figure 1).

6. Claims 5-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard in view of Moriconi and Fuh et al. (6,463,474).

a. Regarding claims 5-6 and 8, Howard et al. disclose a method of authenticating a user of a client computer at a server computer, comprising the steps of:

receiving a service request from the user at a first data processing agent (col. 6, lines 40-42);

submitting an authentication request from the first data processing agent to a second data processing agent to authenticate the user (col. 6, lines 51-52; col. 8, lines 29-32);

authenticating the user at the second data processing agent (col. 6, lines 59-66); if the user is successfully authenticated, storing timeout a value indicative of a predetermined time period (col. 6, lines 1-6, 13-19);

determining whether the predetermined time period is exceeded starting from the last authentication process (col. 6, lines 1-6, 13-19); and

if the predetermined time period is exceeded, requiring the user to be authenticated at the second data processing agent upon receipt of the second service request (col. 6, lines 1-6, 13-19).

Howard does not disclose that the data processing agents are on the same server. Moriconi et al. disclose that two data processing agents are implemented on the same server (col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the method of Howard such that the first and second data processing agents are implemented on the same server to provide maximum performance and minimize network traffic overhead.

Although the second data processing agent in the Howard reference stores a timeout value and enforces a timeout policy for all requests made to the first data processing agent, that timeout policy is not based on a maximum time period allowed since the last request. Fuh discloses a method providing network access control which uses the maximum time allowed since the last request as an authentication requirement; the method comprising the steps of: if the user is successfully authenticated, storing a timeout value indicative of a predetermined time period; determining whether the predetermined time period is exceeded starting from a time of receipt of the previous service request; and if the predetermined time period is exceeded without receiving a service request from the user, requiring the user to be authenticated at the second data processing agent upon receipt of the next service request (col. 12, lines 41-45; col. 14, lines 34, 42-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the method of

Art Unit: 2132

Howard to also use the maximum time allowed since the last request as an authentication requirement and to include the steps of: if the user is successfully authenticated, storing a timeout value indicative of a predetermined time period; determining whether the predetermined time period is exceeded starting from a time of receipt of the first service request; and if the predetermined time period is exceeded without receiving a second service request from the user, requiring the user to be authenticated at the second data processing agent upon receipt of the second service request, as taught in Fuh. The motivation for doing so would have been for the first data processing agent to be able to delete information associated with users that have not initiated any request in a predetermined time period to save memory.

b. Regarding claims 9-11, Howard et al. disclose a method of authenticating a user of a client computer at a server computer, comprising the steps of:

receiving a service request from the user at a first data processing agent (col. 6, lines 40-42);

submitting an authentication request from the first data processing agent to a second data processing agent to authenticate the user (col. 6, lines 51-52; col. 8, lines 29-32);

authenticating the user at the second data processing agent (col. 6, lines 59-66);

Howard does not disclose that the data processing agents are on the same server. Moriconi et al. disclose that two data processing agents are implemented on the same server (col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the method of Howard

such that the first and second data processing agents are implemented on the same server to provide maximum performance and minimize network traffic overhead.

Howard also does not disclose the steps of: if the user is successfully authenticated at the second data processing agent, storing user authentication information at the first data processing agent at the first data processing agent; receiving a next service request from the user at the first data processing agent; authenticating the user at the first data processing agent using the stored information; if the user is successfully authenticated at the first data processing agent, providing the requested service to the user; and if the user is not successfully authenticated at the first data processing agent, submitting an authentication request to the second data processing agent. Fuh discloses a method for providing network access control comprising the steps of: if the user is successfully authenticated at the second data processing agent, storing user authentication information at the first data processing agent at the first data processing agent (col. 12, lines 41-45); receiving a next service request from the user at the first data processing agent (col. 12, lines 52-55); authenticating the user at the first data processing agent using the stored information (col. 12, lines 52-55); if the user is successfully authenticated at the first data processing agent, providing the requested service to the user (col. 12, lines 52-55); and if the user is not successfully authenticated at the first data processing agent, submitting an authentication request to the second data processing agent (col. 14, lines 49-56).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the method of Howard to include the steps of: if the user is successfully

authenticated at the second data processing agent, storing user authentication information at the first data processing agent at the first data processing agent; receiving a next service request from the user at the first data processing agent; authenticating the user at the first data processing agent using the stored information; if the user is successfully authenticated at the first data processing agent, providing the requested service to the user; and if the user is not successfully authenticated at the first data processing agent, submitting an authentication request to the second data processing agent, as taught in Fuh, to achieve advantage and improvement in authentication speed and efficiency.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard in view of Moriconi and Fuh as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Sampson et al. (6,490,624). Howard, Moriconi and Fuh, in the method of claim 5, do not disclose that the first data processing agent, upon receipt of the second request, transmits a notification to the second data processing agent so that the second data processing agent can use the new time for checking against a future request. Sampson discloses a system in which one data processing agent, upon receipt of a request, notifies other agents so that they can update their corresponding "Last Access Time" value and use the updated value to make decision regarding a future request (col. 13, lines 24-28; col. 14, lines 6-12; 22-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the method of Howard such that the first data processing agent, upon receipt of the second request, transmits a notification to the

second data processing agent so that the second data processing agent can use the new time for checking against a future request, as suggested by Sampson, to facilitates security of the system.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reiche (6,092,196) discloses an HTTP distributed remote user authentication system.

Putzolu (6,578,076) discloses a policy-based network management system using dynamic policy generation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dinh whose telephone number is 703-306-5617. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri: 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 703-305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

Gilberto B 
Minh Dinh
GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Application/Control Number: 09/585,747
Art Unit: 2132

Page 10

Examiner
Art Unit 2132

MD
January 30, 2004